

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

WILLIAM JAMES ANDERSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 2:19-cv-00211-SU (lead case)
No. 2:18-cv-01932-SU (trailing case)
No. 2:18-cv-01971-SU (trailing case)

ORDER

UMATILLA COUNTY, et al.,

Defendants.

HERNÁNDEZ, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Sullivan issued a Findings and Recommendation on December 18, 2020, in which she recommends that this Court grant Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. F&R, ECF 41. The matter is now before the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b).

Plaintiff filed timely objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation. Pl. Obj., ECF 43. When any party objects to any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the

Magistrate Judge's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Dawson v. Marshall*, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc).


The Court has carefully considered Plaintiff's objections and concludes that there is no basis to modify the Findings & Recommendation. The Court has also reviewed the pertinent portions of the record *de novo* and finds no error in the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation.

CONCLUSION

The Court ADOPTS Magistrate Judge Sullivan's Findings and Recommendation [41]. Therefore, Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 31, 2021.



Marco A. Hernández
MARCO A. HERNÁNDEZ
United States District Judge